Wisconsin Department of Administration Division of Executive Budget and Finance DOA-2048 (R07/2000)

## Fiscal Estimate - 2001 Session

☑ Original ☐ Updated	Corrected	Supplemental
LRB Number <b>01-4302/1</b>	Introduction Nun	nber SB-383
Subject		
Residence of sex offenders		
Fiscal Effect		
Appropriations  Decrease Existing  Appropriations  Re Appropriations  Create New Appropriations  Local:	crease Existing absorvenues	ase Costs - May be possible to b within agency's budget Yes No ease Costs
Permissive Mandatory Permissive Mandatory Permissive Mandatory Permissive Mandatory	rease Revenue Units A To Trissive Mandatory Crease Revenue Sc	ounties Others
Fund Sources Affected  GPR FED PRO PRS	Affected C SEGS 20.410 (1)	h. 20 Appropriations
Agency/Prepared By	Authorized Signature	Date
DOC/ Cathy Halpin (608) 240-5538	Robert Margolies (608) 240-5056	

# Fiscal Estimate Narratives DOC 1/29/02

LRB Number <b>01-4302/1</b>	Introduction Number	SB-383	Estimate Type	Original
Subject				
Residence of sex offenders				

#### **Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal Estimate**

This bill places additional restrictions upon persons convicted of a serious sex offense. Under this bill, any child sex offender placed on parole, extended supervision or probation, is prohibited from residing within 1,000 feet of any state, county, city, village, or town park; a multiunit public housing project; a public swimming pool; a child care facility; a youth center; a community center; or any private or public school.

#### Departmental Impact:

During calendar year 2000, 725 serious child sex offenders as defined in this bill were either placed on parole (359) or probation (366). It is assumed that 725 is the average number of serious sex offenders placed in the community each year and that the average supervision time for each offender is 5 years. Thus, for each of the first five years of any housing program, total offender populations will grow by 725 inmates per year, capping out at 3,625 offenders in year 5. During year 6, 725 additional offenders will be supervised but the first 725 to enter the program will drop off supervision roles. Note that it is also assumed that serious child sex offenders receiving probation will no longer be allowed to live in their current residence due to the 1,000 foot rule, whether owned or rented.

The attached maps demonstrate that Department staff will find it extremely difficult to find housing for offenders in several counties with large urban areas (Brown, Racine, Kenosha, Milwaukee, and Dane) once the 1,000-foot rule is implemented. In addition, communities have increasingly placed pressure on landlords and homeowners to refuse housing to sex offenders. It is also assumed that each of Wisconsin's 72 counties will have at least a handful of serious sex offenders released into the community or placed on probation every year. Due to these pressures, it is assumed that the Department will no longer be able to locate housing for serious sex offenders except in rural areas of every county.

Very few employment opportunities are available in rural areas of Wisconsin. Additionally, there is no public transportation so offenders will need Department assistance in acquiring both a job and transportation to and from any work opportunities and general purposes such as grocery shopping and medical appointments. Probation and Parole Agents' travel time for home visits could also increase under the provisions of this bill.

2001 Wisconsin Act 16 directs the Department under s. 301.03 (19), Wis. Stats. "...to minimize to the greatest extent possible, the residential population density of sex offenders...who are on probation, parole, or extended supervision..." If the Department assumes that housing must be located in rural areas of every county, and that each of the approximately 3,600 offenders must be dispersed, it appears unrealistic that sufficient existing housing exists.

This bill does not require the Department to construct and manage housing for offenders. Nevertheless, one option is for the Department to construct multi-unit-housing units in rural areas of each county. Assuming a construction cost of \$35,000 per offender to construct efficiency apartments, the five-year building costs total \$126,875,000, excluding the costs of purchasing land. A second option is the Department could purchase and manage existing rural motel/hotel units in counties where they are available.

The Department could also contract with rural temporary living placement vendors who would construct and manage housing in rural areas. The Department is currently paying an average of \$27.25 per night for beds. Total annual costs for 3,625 beds would total \$36,385,900. This would provide the added benefit of on-site vendor staff to provide on-site supervision.

Offenders paying rent for the units would offset some of the costs of any of these options. If we assume each offender pays \$400 per month, once employed, at the end of the five-year period, annual revenue is approximately \$17,400,000.

### Local Government Impact:

Multi-unit housing units that are constructed by the State in rural areas may remove land from tax roles thus reducing a community's tax revenues.

**Long-Range Fiscal Implications** 









